

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

ANGELA F. HOOVER,	)	
	)	Civil Action
Plaintiff	)	No. 10-cv-06856
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
MIDLAND CREDIT MANAGEMENT, INC,	)	
	)	
Defendant	)	

O R D E R

NOW, this 30<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012, upon consideration  
of the following:

- (1) Defendant, Midland Credit Management, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint, which motion to dismiss was filed June 6, 2011 (Document 29), together with
  - (a) Memorandum of Law in Support of Midland Credit Management, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Document 29-1);
- (2) Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, which opposition was filed June 21, 2011 (Document 31); together with
  - (a) Plaintiff's Brief in Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Document 31-1);
- (3) Reply of Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc. to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Dismiss, which reply was filed July 8, 2011 (Document 34);
- (4) Sur-Reply of Plaintiff, Angela Hoover, in Further Opposition to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, which sur-reply was filed July 22, 2011 (Document 38);
- (5) Supplemental Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendant Midland Credit Management's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint, which supplemental memorandum was filed by defendant on February 14, 2012 (Document 44);

- (6) Plaintiff's Supplemental Memorandum of Law in Further Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings (sic)<sup>1</sup>, which supplemental memorandum was filed on February 14, 2012 (Document 45);
- (7) Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc.'s Reply to Plaintiff's Supplemental Memorandum, which reply was filed on February 14, 2012 (Document 46); and
- (8) Amended Complaint, filed by plaintiff May 27, 2011 (Document 28);

and for the reasons articulated in the accompanying Opinion,

IT IS ORDERED that defendant's motion to dismiss is granted.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that plaintiff's Amended Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ James Knoll Gardner  
James Knoll Gardner  
United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> Defendant Midland Credit Management, Inc. filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings on March 14, 2011 (Document 16). By my Order dated April 28, 2011 and filed April 29, 2011, I dismissed the motion for judgment on the pleadings as moot. Plaintiff's "Supplemental Memorandum of Law in Further Opposition to Defendant's Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings", which supplemental memorandum was filed February 14, 2012 as Document 45, is mislabeled. It is actually a memorandum in opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss, not defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings.